DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 126 300 CE 007 386

AUTHOR	Lewis, James P.
TITLE	Evaluation of 1973-74 Vocational Programs in the Eight Pennsylvania State Correctional Institutions.
INSTITUTION	Pennsylvania Research Coordinating Unit for Vocational Education, Harrisburg.
REPORT NO	VT-102-903
PUB DATE	Jul 74
NOTE	26p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Career Planning; Correctional Education; *Corrective Institutions; Participant Satisfaction; *Prisoners; Program Attitudes; *Program Evaluation; Relevance (Education); State Programs; Surveys; Tables (Data); *Vocational Education; *Vocational Rehabilitation
IDENTIFIERS	*Pennsylvania

ABSTRACT

The evaluation study of the first year of a vocational education program in eight correctional institutions in Pennsylvania sought to determine the participants' views of the program and the quality of the different program offerings. A training survey was administered to the participants to obtain information on their career goals, vocational courses, method of course selection, attitude toward course work, value of the course, and skill level. Information on the status and quality of the vocational programs was provided through instructors' responses to a program evaluation form. The sample consisted of 405 male and 23 female offenders and 59 instructors. Although offenders generally held positive views about the importance of vocational courses to future jobs, findings indicate that many were enrolled in programs with little or no relationship to their career plans or assistance in obtaining employment. Instructors generally agreed with offenders' overall belief that they possessed average skill in their course work. Most instructors rated program quality as average. Results of nine specific objectives appear in narrative and tabular form. Recommendations by the offenders for improvement of the vocational program are included in the report. Instruments used to collect the data are also included. (NJ)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED126300

EVALUATION OF 1973-74 VOCATIONAL PROGRAMS IN THE EIGHT PENNSYLVANIA STATE CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTIONS

James P. Lewis
Research Associate

Research Coordinating Unit
Division of Research
Bureau of Information Systems
Pennsylvania Department of Education
Box 911
Harrisburg, Pa. 17126

July 1974

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

CE007883

Commonwealth of Pennsylvania
Milton J. Shapp, Governor

Department of Education
John C. Pittenger, Secretary
David W. Hornbeck, Executive Deputy

Bureau of Information Systems
Seon H. Cho, Director

Division of Research
Robert B. Hayes, Director

Pennsylvania Department of Education
Box 911
Harrisburg, Pa.17126

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Summary	1
Background	2
Objectives	3
Program Descriptions	3
Methods and Procedures	4
Results	6
Discussion	14
Appendix A - Training Survey	19
Appendix B - Program Evaluation Form	20

VT 102 903

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1.	Number of Offenders and Instructors In Each Institution Completing the Questionnaires	5
2.	Offenders' Response to Item 1	6
3.	Offenders Enrolled in Courses Not Congruent with Career Plans	7
4.	Major Problems Indicated By Offenders in Getting a Job	8
5.	Composite of Who is Helping Offenders in Securing Employment	9
6.	Offenders' Response to Item 6	10
7.	Offenders' Response to Item 8	10
8.	Reasons Why Offenders are in Vocational Courses	12
9.	Offenders' Response to Item 5	13
10.	Offenders' Response to Item 9	13
11.	Offenders' and Instructors' Response to Item 9	13
12.	Offenders' Response to Item 7	14
13.	Offenders Enrolled in Vocational Courses as of April 22, 1974	15
14.	Staff Responses to Each of the 19 Items on the Program Evaluation Form	16
15.	Rank Order of the Most Frequent Recommendations by Offenders for Improving the Vocational Programs	17

SUMMARY

The purpose of the study was to evaluate the first year of Part B-Ancillary Vocational Education Offenders' projects in Pennsylvania. The study sought to determine the offenders' views of the programs and to determine the quality of the different program offerings.

The conclusions derived from the evaluation were as follows:

1. Many offenders were enrolled in vocational programs that had moderate to little or no relationship to their career plans.

2. A high number of offenders indicated that no one is helping them obtain employment.

3. In general, the correctional institutions provide a good orientation on the importance of vocational courses to future employment and on the various course selections.

4. In most cases, offenders have positive views about the importance of vocational courses to future jobs.

5. The main reasons why offenders are in vocational courses are because they fit their future plans, interests and previous experiences.

6. Most offenders believe they possess average skill in their course work. Instructors seem to agree with the offenders' self-assessment.

7. Almost all of the offenders enjoy their vocational courses.

8. Approximately seven per cent of the offenders were enrolled in 27 different vocational courses. The most popular courses were auto mechanics, welding, masonry and electricity.

9. Most instructors rate the quality of their program as average.

Based upon the experiences gained in conducting the evaluation, the following recommendations are offered:

1. An exploratory vocational course lasting two to four weeks should be provided by each institution. This course should help offenders make course selections that are more congruent with their career plans.

2. A prerelease job preparation course at each institution with job finding skills and with accurate information about job opportunities should be provided.

3. Each institution should assign a liaison person to work with prereleased offenders and agencies that provide employment services. This person should not try to place prereleased offenders but rather to coordinate the efforts of the agencies that provide job placement services.

4. An employment feedback system for the released offenders should be developed and managed by each institution. A questionnaire sent to

the ex-offender's mailing address could be a first step in obtaining employment information. Questionnaire findings should provide valuable information for planning and conducting vocational programs.

5. A publicity program should be conducted by each institution because only seven per cent of the offenders are enrolled in vocational programs.

6. The correctional institutions should coordinate social events, visiting hours, work details, etc., so there is little conflict with the vocational program.

7. The educational director at each institution should request weekly reports from each instructor as to what was accomplished in his/her class. These reports should be summarized and sent to the Intermediate Unit coordinator.

8. IU coordinators should submit monthly reports to T. Dean Witmer, Pennsylvania Department of Education, and James Smith, Bureau of Corrections. This report should contain information on the number of visits, consultant services, budget information and recommendations. Weekly reports of educational directors should be included.

9. The evaluation for fiscal 1974-75 will seek to determine the role of the IU coordinators, educational directors and liaison persons (if hired) for job placement. More emphasis will be placed on evaluating lesson plans, courses of study and teaching techniques. Last, an attempt will be made to follow-up the ex-offender to determine if he/she has found employment related to his/her vocational program.

BACKGROUND

Offenders make up one of the most vocationally handicapped groups in our society. They are poorly educated, usually dropouts, and seldom does one ever attain an employable skill which provides a respectable wage and self-respect. The offenders must face long periods of unemployment, humiliation and depression, even though they may possess a salable skill and have the motivation to do an honest day's work.

Society does not accept, to any great degree, the ex-offenders, regardless of time spent incarcerated or efforts involved in their rehabilitation. Traditionally, rehabilitation and education programs in the correctional system have been somewhat ineffective mainly because funds and proper program planning are insufficient. With releasing Part B-Ancillary vocational funds and assuming the responsibility and assurance of accountability, the Pennsylvania Department of Education hopes the previous failures and inadequacies in prison education programs can be reversed.

Alternatives can now be offered and the institutionalized offender can choose from a variety of vocational education programs leading to self-improvement and career-oriented experiences.

Each correctional institution is developing vocational programs based on the vocational aspirations of the offenders and labor market needs. The programs at each institution differ, mainly because of physical plant difference and other types of existing programs.

OBJECTIVES

General Program Objectives

1. To provide incarcerated offenders with salable skills.

2. To reduce recidivism.

3. To coordinate the efforts of correctional institutions, Intermediate Units, Pennsylvania Department of Education, Board of Parole and job placement agencies for offenders and ex-offenders.

Evaluation Objectives

1. To determine the relationship between offenders, career goals and their present vocational courses.

2. To determine offenders' assessment of the value of their vocational course in obtaining employment.

3. To determine how offenders are selected for various vocational courses.

4A. To determine offenders' self-assessment of their skill level.

4B. To determine the relationship between offenders' self-assessment and instructors' assessment of their skill level.

5. To determine offenders' general attitude toward their course work.

6. To determine the number of offenders enrolled in the vocational programs.

7. To determine staff assessment on the quality and status of the vocational programs.

PROGRAM DESCRIPTIONS

State Correctional Institution, Graterford

The program will take advantage of resources at the Montgomery County Area Vocational-Technical School and the Montgomery County Community College. A total of 37 offenders were served during the school year in the following courses: basic typewriting, food services, piano tuning, dental technology, business speech, business math, business English, automotive, housewiring, basic electronics, carpentry, photography and machine shop.

State Correctional Institution, Huntingdon

This program is developing relationships with the Bureau of Employment Security, Vocational Rehabilitation and Manpower Training. Some 95 offenders are enrolled in clothing, printing, soap plant, farm, electrical, plumbing, furniture/upholstery, hair styling, food preparation, welding, painting, air conditioning, practical nursing, shop math and shop English.

State Correctional Institution, Camp Hill

The program involves 23 offenders in day and evening classes to complement present on-the-job training experiences. The day school offers auto mechanics, bricklaying, agricultural education, the last one including exploratory experiences in small engine repair, welding, electricity/electronics and freight terminal operations. The evening subjects include auto mechanics, bricklaying, electronics, freight terminal operations, welding, small engine repair and animal sciences.

State Correctional Institution, Dallas

A preapprenticeship training program involving some 95 offenders uses tradespeople as instructors in the building trades and industrial fields. Complementing this is an in-service training program provided by the RCA Service Company for all trade and professional staff. Specific courses are offered in printing, sign painting, welding, sheet metal, electronics/electricity, plumbing/heating, air conditioning/refrigeration and barbering.

State Correctional Institution, Pittsburgh

Sixty-two offenders are enrolled in trade and social training courses. Trade training includes plumbing, auto mechanics, meat cutting, fitting and alteration, bricklaying and welding. Social training consists primarily of courses in human behavior and money management.

State Correctional Institution, Rockview

The program involves 58 offenders in day and evening classes. The courses being taught are television repair, masonry, drafting, welding, auto mechanics, electricity, forestry aid, nursery aid, heavy equipment operator and surveying principles. Some classes are held in the Centre County AVTS and at the Pennsylvania State University.

State Correctional Institution, Greensburg

A total of 33 offenders is enrolled in vocational courses related to the work-release program at the institution. The program provides instruction in photography, meat cutting, carpentry, auto mechanics, welding, masonry and machine shop. Facilities at the Central Westmoreland AVTS are used extensively.

METHODS AND PROCEDURES

General Design

A descriptive analysis was conducted for Evaluation Objectives 1, 2, 3, 4A, 5, 6 and 7. The Pearson Product-Moment Correlation was used to analyze Evaluation Objective 4B.

Instruments

The instrumentation employed to obtain the input data was as follows:

- Training Survey, a questionnaire, was administered to offenders to obtain information on their (1) career goals, (2) vocational courses, (3) method of selecting courses, (4) attitude toward the course work, (5) value of the course and (6) skill level.

- Program Evaluation Form was sent to instructors for the purpose of obtaining information on the status and quality of the vocational programs.

Sample

Subjects for the study were a sample of 405 male and 23 female offenders from the eight state correctional institutions. A sample of 59 instructors also provided input data. The sample represents approximately all of the offenders, both male and female, in vocational courses.

A breakdown by correctional institutions follows:

TABLE 1
NUMBER OF OFFENDERS AND INSTRUCTORS
IN EACH INSTITUTION COMPLETING THE QUESTIONNAIRES

Correctional Institution	No. Offender	No. Instructor
Camp Hill	23	5
Graterford	37	8
Huntingdon	95	16
Muncy	25	6
Rockview	58	5
Greensburg	33	5
Pittsburgh	62	7
Dallas	95	7
TOTAL	428	59

Procedures

Each offender in the sample completed the Training Survey (Appendix A), the instructor verifying the descriptive data at the top of the form. Each offender answered questions 1 through 9. The instructor also answered question 9 for each offender in the course by placing his initial next to the level he felt the offender achieved.

Each instructor in the sample completed the Program Evaluation Form (Appendix B). The instructors completed the left side market STAFF. The right side marked TEAM was to be completed by a team comprised of T. Dean Witmer, Bureau of Vocational Education, James P. Lewis, Research Coordinating Unit and James Smith, Bureau of Justice. Due to the lack of time, the Team was unable to complete the right side of the forms.

The Training Survey and the Program Evaluation Form were completed during the week of April 22.

Data Analysis

Descriptive statistics were used to analyze data on the Training Survey and Program Evaluation Form.

RESULTS

The results section is structured to reflect the outcomes for the seven previously stated evaluation objectives. Thus, the outcomes relating to each objective are reported separately.

Evaluation Objective 1. To determine the relationship between offenders' career goals and their present vocational courses.

The Training Survey Item 1 was used to answer Evaluation Objective 1. Offenders from the eight state correctional institutions completed the survey.

Item 1. How do you plan to earn a living when you are released:

TABLE 2
OFFENDERS' RESPONSE TO ITEM 1

		Relationship of Vocational Courses to Career Goals					
		High		Moderate		Little	
Institution	Number	(%)	N	(%)	N	(%)	N
Camp Hill	23	(57)	13	(17)	4	(26)	6
Graterford	34	(97)	33	----	--	(3)	1
Huntingdon	93	(69)	64	(12)	11	(19)	18
Muncy	23	(17)	4	(9)	2	(74)	17
Rockview	58	(36)	21	(7)	5	(55)	32
Greensburg	28	(32)	9	(25)	7	(43)	12
Pittsburgh	61	(59)	36	(15)	9	(26)	16
Dallas	66	(67)	44	(11)	7	(23)	15
TOTAL	386	(58)	224	(12)	45	(30)	117

An examination of Table 2 totals shows the majority of offenders' plans (58 per cent) are highly related to their course selections. It should be pointed out, however, that 42 per cent of the offenders are in programs not related to their career plans. This result could develop into a significant problem in job placement when considering the difficulty in placing even the best trained and qualified ex-offender. Table 3 (page 7) shows the number of offenders enrolled in courses not congruent with career plans.

Evaluation Objective 2. To determine offenders' assessment of the value of their vocational courses in obtaining employment.

The Training Survey Items 2, 3, 6 and 8 were used to answer Evaluation Objective 2. A sample from each state correctional institution answered the form.

Item 2. What will be your biggest problem about getting a job?

Table 4 (page 8) shows these response per cents: prison record, 44; no problem, 31; other reasons, 21; and four, they have jobs waiting. The evidence clearly indicates that 31 per cent of the offenders are not realistic in their self-assessment of their predicament.

Item 3. Who is advising you in securing employment?

Table 5 (page 9) shows the response as follows: no one, 60 per cent; family, 14 per cent; instructors, six per cent; sponsor, five per cent; trade school, five per cent; and the remaining responses equal 16 per cent. The high number of 256 (60 per cent of the offenders) indicating that no one is helping them in securing employment could be a deterrent for any vocational program.

TABLE 3
OFFENDERS ENROLLED IN COURSES
NOT CONGRUENT WITH CAREER PLANS

No.	Description of Career Field	No.	Description of Career Field
25	No plans	1	Presser
12	Truck driver	1	Surveying
11	Construction	1	Mill work
7	Welding	1	Upholstering
6	Further education	1	Auto body
3	Electrical	1	Teaching
3	Food preparation	1	Operating engineering
3	Self-employed	1	Computer operator
3	Machine operator	1	Seaman
3	Auto mechanics	1	Textile worker
3	Painter	1	Meat cutter
3	Hospital worker	1	Plumbing
2	Steel worker	1	Foundry worker
2	Draftsman	1	Barbering
2	Railroad worker	1	Forest machine repair
2	Auto sales	1	Elevator repair
2	Photographer	1	Roofer
2	RCA worker	1	Mason
1	Dental technician	1	Home improvement
1	Accounting	1	Paraprofessional
1	Telephone lineman	1	Keypunch operator
1	Community service	1	Switchboard operator
1	Musician	1	Office work
1	Typewriter repair	1	Social worker
1	Sales	1	Mixologist
1	Neon sign repair	1	Professional boxer
1	Printing		

Table 6 (page 10) shows the results of responses to Item 6: Were you told how your present program may help you get a job? The totals indicate: yes, 87 per cent;

TABLE 4

MAJOR PROBLEMS INDICATED BY OFFENDERS IN GETTING A JOB

Problem or Condition	Camp Hill (%)	Camp Hill N	Graterford (%)	Graterford N	Huntingdon (%)	Huntingdon N	Muncy (%)	Muncy N	Rockview (%)	Rockview N	Greensburg (%)	Greensburg N	Pittsburgh (%)	Pittsburgh N	Dallas (%)	Dallas N	Total (%)	Total N
Prison Record	(58)	11	(19)	6	(36)	32	(41)	7	(50)	28	(20)	5	(55)	29	(55)	45	(44)	163
No Problem	(26)	5	(68)	21	(30)	26	(41)	7	(27)	15	(32)	8	(31)	16	(21)	18	(31)	116
Not Qualified	----	--	----	--	(6)	5	(12)	2	(2)	1	(24)	6	(8)	4	(11)	9	(7)	27
Have Job	----	--	----	--	(10)	9	(6)	1	(4)	2	(8)	2	----	--	----	--	(4)	14
Fitting Job to Training	----	--	----	--	(7)	6	----	--	(4)	2	----	--	(4)	2	(3)	2	(3)	12
Don't Know Where to Look	----	--	(3)	1	(6)	5	----	--	(2)	1	(12)	3	----	--	(3)	2	(3)	12
Getting Released	(11)	2	(10)	3	(2)	2	----	--	----	--	----	--	----	--	(3)	2	(2)	9
Community Adjustment	----	--	----	--	----	--	----	--	(7)	4	(4)	1	----	--	----	--	(1)	5
Money to Get Started	----	--	----	--	(3)	3	----	--	(2)	1	----	--	(2)	1	----	--	(1)	5
Finding an Interesting Job	----	--	----	--	----	--	----	--	(2)	1	----	--	----	--	(4)	3	(1)	4
Transportation	(5)	1	----	--	----	--	----	--	----	--	----	--	----	--	----	--	(1)	1
TOTAL	(100)	19	(100)	31	(100)	88	(100)	17	(100)	55	(100)	25	(100)	52	(100)	81	(100)	369

TABLE 5

COMPOSITE OF WHO IS HELPING OFFENDERS IN SECURING EMPLOYMENT

Agency	Camp Hill (%)	Camp Hill N	Graterford (%)	Graterford N	Huntingdon (%)	Huntingdon N	Muncy (%)	Muncy N	Rockview (%)	Rockview N	Greensburg (%)	Greensburg N	Pittsburgh (%)	Pittsburgh N	Dallas (%)	Dallas N	Total (%)	Total N
No One	(22)	4	(11)	3	(53)	43	(31)	4	(52)	28	(70)	16	(53)	23	(60)	53	(60)	256
Family	(28)	5	(14)	4	(18)	14	(15)	2	(24)	13	----	--	(4)	2	(24)	21	(14)	61
Instructor	(22)	4	----	--	(4)	3	(15)	2	----	--	----	--	(25)	11	(6)	5	(6)	25
Sponsor	----	--	(7)	2	(4)	3	(23)	3	(9)	5	(13)	3	(6)	3	(4)	3	(5)	22
Trade School	----	--	(68)	19	----	--	----	--	----	--	----	--	----	--	----	--	(5)	19
Counselor	(18)	3	----	--	(6)	5	(8)	1	(4)	2	(9)	2	(2)	1	----	--	(3)	14
Past Employer	----	--	----	--	(5)	4	----	--	(7)	4	----	--	----	--	(2)	2	(2)	10
B.V.R.	----	--	----	--	(3)	2	----	--	----	--	----	--	(8)	4	(1)	1	(2)	7
Friend	(5)	1	----	--	(4)	3	----	--	(4)	2	----	--	(2)	1	----	--	(2)	7
Parole Officer	(5)	1	----	--	----	--	(8)	1	----	--	(4)	1	----	--	(2)	2	(1)	5
D.E.S.	----	--	----	--	(3)	2	----	--	----	--	(4)	1	----	--	(1)	1	(1)	4
TOTAL	(100)	18	(100)	28	(100)	79	(100)	13	(100)	54	(100)	23	(100)	45	(100)	88	(100)	430

and no, 13 per cent. This positive finding shows that the correctional institutions are realistically relating the importance of vocational courses to future jobs.

Table 7 (page 10) shows the per cent in each category as follows: yes, 94 per cent; and no, six per cent. The responses were similar to those reported in Item 6 in the previous question. Generally, the offenders realize the importance of vocational programs for future employment.

Item 6. Were you told how your present program may help you get a job?

TABLE 6
OFFENDERS' RESPONSE TO ITEM 6

Institution	Number	Yes (%)	Yes N	No (%)	No N
Camp Hill	23	(65)	15	(35)	8
Graterford	38	(95)	36	(5)	2
Huntingdon	91	(92)	84	(8)	7
Muncy	22	(77)	17	(23)	5
Rockview	57	(74)	42	(26)	15
Greensburg	33	(88)	29	(12)	4
Pittsburgh	62	(85)	53	(15)	9
Dallas	95	(97)	92	(3)	3
TOTAL	421	(87)	368	(13)	53

Item 8. Do you feel the program offered is improving your ability to earn a living?

TABLE 7
OFFENDERS' RESPONSE TO ITEM 8

Institution	Number	Yes (%)	Yes N	No (%)	No N
Camp Hill	23	(87)	20	(13)	3
Graterford	38	(100)	38	----	--
Huntingdon	93	(95)	88	(5)	5
Muncy	21	(95)	20	(5)	1
Rockview	58	(90)	52	(10)	6
Greensburg	33	(82)	27	(18)	6
Pittsburgh	62	(97)	60	(3)	2
Dallas	95	(98)	93	(2)	2
TOTAL	423	(94)	398	(6)	25

Evaluation Objective 3. To determine how offenders are selected for various vocational courses.

The Training Survey Items 4 and 5 were used to answer Evaluation Objective 3. A sample from each state correctional institution answered the form.

Item 4. Why are you in this course?

An examination of Table 8 (page 12) totals shows the response to Item 4 as follows: have interest in the course, 36 per cent; good course for future plans, 45 per cent; had previous experience, 12 per cent; and the remaining reasons total five per cent. The results clearly indicate that offenders have legitimate reasons for being in the vocational programs.

Table 9 (page 13) totals (yes, 85 per cent; and no, 15 per cent) indicate that the correctional institutions are giving a good orientation in this regard to the vocational programs.

Item 5. Were you told about all the options available to you in this program?

Evaluation Objective 4A. To determine offenders' self-assessment of their skill level.

The Training Survey Item 9 was used to answer Evaluation Objective 4A. A sample from each state correctional institution answered the form.

Item 9. What skill level are you presently at?

Table 10 (page 13) totals shows the response as follows: average skill, 66 per cent; above average skill, 15 per cent; below average skill, 10 per cent; superior skill, eight per cent; and very little or no skill, one per cent. The results show that most offenders consider themselves to possess average skill in their course work.

Evaluation Objective 4B. To determine the relationship between offenders' self-assessment and instructors' assessment of their skill level.

The Training Survey Item 9 was also used to answer Evaluation Objective 4B. A sample of instructors and offenders from the following institutions completed the item: Camp Hill, Huntingdon, Muncy, Greensburg, Pittsburgh and Dallas.

Item 9. What skill level are you presently at?

Table 11 (page 13) shows the correlations between offenders' self-assessment and instructors' assessment of their skill level. The results clearly indicate that the offenders have a realistic view of their skill level.

Evaluation Objective 5. To determine offenders' general attitude towards their course work.

The Training Survey Item 7 was used to answer Evaluation Objective 5. A sample from each state correctional institution completed the survey.

Item 7. Do you enjoy your program work?

TABLE 8

REASONS WHY OFFENDERS ARE IN VOCATIONAL COURSES

Reason	Camp Hill (%)	Camp Hill N	Graterford (%)	Graterford N	Huntingdon (%)	Huntingdon N	Muncy (%)	Muncy N	Rockview (%)	Rockview N	Greensburg (%)	Greensburg N	Pittsburgh (%)	Pittsburgh N	Dallas (%)	Dallas N	Totals (%)	Totals N
Only One Available	(4)	1	(5)	5	----	--	(14)	3	(3)	2	----	--	(3)	2	----	--	(3)	13
Have Interest in the Course	(23)	5	(34)	32	(47)	17	(40)	9	(30)	18	(34)	11	(39)	24	(40)	38	(36)	154
Had Previous Experience	(9)	2	(10)	9	(6)	2	(14)	3	(19)	11	(18)	6	(13)	8	(10)	9	(12)	50
Good Course for Future Plans	(60)	13	(48)	46	(44)	16	(32)	7	(36)	21	(45)	15	(42)	26	(48)	45	(45)	189
Something to Do	----	--	----	--	(3)	1	----	--	----	--	(3)	1	----	--	(1)	1	(1)	3
Recommended by Prison Officials	(4)	1	(1)	1	----	--	----	--	----	--	----	--	(3)	2	(1)	1	(1)	5
Other	----	--	(2)	2	----	--	----	--	(12)	7	----	--	----	--	----	--	(2)	9
TOTAL	(100)	22	(100)	95	(100)	36	(100)	22	(100)	59	(100)	33	(100)	62	(100)	94	(100)	423

TABLE 9
OFFENDERS' RESPONSE TO ITEM 5

Institution	Number	Yes (%)	Yes N	No (%)	No N
Camp Hill	23	(70)	16	(30)	7
Graterford	38	(95)	36	(5)	2
Huntingdon	92	(87)	80	(13)	12
Muncy	22	(91)	20	(9)	2
Rockview	58	(11)	41	(29)	17
Greensburg	34	(74)	25	(16)	9
Pittsburgh	62	(85)	53	(15)	9
Dallas	95	(95)	90	(5)	5
TOTAL	424	(85)	361	(15)	63

TABLE 10
OFFENDERS' RESPONSE TO ITEM 9

Institution	Average Skill (%)	Average Skill N	Above Average Skill (%)	Above Average Skill N	Below Average Skill (%)	Below Average Skill N	Very Little or No Skill (%)	Very Little or No Skill N	Superior (%)	Superior N	Total (%)	Total N
Camp Hill	(65)	14	(23)	5	(4)	1	(4)	1	(4)	1	(100)	22
Graterford	(44)	14	----	--	(25)	8	(31)	10	----	--	(100)	32
Huntingdon	(62)	58	(13)	12	(16)	15	(3)	3	(5)	5	(100)	93
Muncy	(75)	17	(17)	4	(4)	1	(4)	1	----	--	(100)	23
Rockview	(66)	34	(13)	7	(13)	7	(4)	2	(2)	1	(100)	51
Greensburg	(61)	20	(33)	11	(3)	1	(3)	1	----	--	(100)	33
Pittsburgh	(56)	34	(19)	12	(11)	7	(3)	7	(11)	7	(100)	62
Dallas	(82)	78	(13)	12	(3)	3	(1)	1	(1)	1	(100)	95
Total	(66)	269	(15)	63	(10)	43	(5)	21	(4)	15	(100)	411

TABLE 11
OFFENDERS' AND INSTRUCTORS' RESPONSE TO ITEM 9

Institution	Number	Mean Score (offender)	Mean Score (instructor)	Correlation
Camp Hill	16	3.12	2.93	.82*
Huntingdon	67	2.98	2.85	.49*
Muncy	12	3.16	3.58	.67*
Greensburg	30	3.26	2.93	.54*
Pittsburgh	45	3.31	3.15	.73*
Dallas	51	3.01	2.80	.28*
Total	221			

*Significant at the .05 level.

Table 12 totals show the response as follows: yes, 97 per cent; no, three per cent. The responses clearly indicate that the offenders enjoy their vocational programs.

TABLE 12
OFFENDERS' RESPONSE TO ITEM 7

Institution	Number	Yes (%)	Yes N	No (%)	No N
Camp Hill	23	(87)	20	(13)	3
Graterford	38	(100)	38	----	--
Huntingdon	85	(96)	82	(4)	3
Muncy	22	(91)	20	(9)	2
Rockview	57	(95)	54	(5)	3
Greensburg	32	(100)	32	----	--
Pittsburgh	61	(100)	61	----	--
Dallas	95	(100)	95	----	--
TOTAL	413	(97)		(3)	11

Evaluation Objective 6. To determine the number of offenders enrolled in vocational programs.

The data on the Training Survey was used to determine the number of offenders enrolled in the various vocational programs at the eight correctional institutions, as of April 22, 1974. It should be noted that some offenders were absent from class during the week of April 22, 1974.

An examination of Table 13 (page 15) shows the number of offenders in the various vocational programs. It should be noted that only about seven per cent (428) of the total offender population (approximately 6,000) are in vocational programs.

Evaluation Objective 7. To determine staff assessment on the quality and status of vocational programs.

The Program Evaluation Form (Appendix B) was administered to a sample of instructors from the eight state correctional institutions for the purpose of obtaining information on the status and quality of the vocational programs.

The results of the Program Evaluation Form for each institution are given in Table 14 (page 16). In general, the rating on each item is average. It should be pointed out, however, that the evaluation team did not have the time to verify the responses of the staff.

DISCUSSION

The first evaluation objective dealt with determining the relationship between offenders' career goals and their present vocational courses. It was surprising to find that 30 per cent of the offenders were in vocational programs that had little or no relationship to their career plans. Considering the difficulty in

TABLE 13

OFFENDERS ENROLLED IN VOCATIONAL COURSES
AS OF APRIL 22, 1974

Course	Institution								Total
	Camp Hill	Graterford	Huntingdon	Muncy	Rockview	Greensburg	Pittsburgh	Dallas	
Masonry	-	-	10	-	7	5	5	-	27
Welding	3	-	5	-	6	8	13	-	35
Auto Mechanics	6	12	-	-	8	6	11	-	43
Electricity	-	15	-	-	8	-	-	15	38
Electronics	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	19	19
Carpentry	-	-	-	-	-	4	-	-	4
Plumbing	-	-	-	-	-	-	6	14	20
Agriculture	-	-	4	-	-	-	-	-	4
Painting	-	-	9	-	-	-	-	-	9
Printing	-	-	16	-	-	-	-	15	31
Clothing	-	-	-	-	-	-	9	-	9
Upholstery	-	-	9	-	-	-	-	-	9
Barbering	-	-	12	-	-	-	-	-	12
Drafting	-	-	4	-	12	-	13	-	29
Air Conditioning	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	9	9
Meat Cutting	-	-	-	-	-	-	5	15	20
Food Preparation	-	-	11	-	-	-	-	-	11
Horticulture	-	-	-	17	-	-	-	-	17
Homemaking	-	-	-	8	-	-	-	-	8
TV Repair	-	-	-	-	5	-	-	-	5
Forestry Aid	-	-	-	-	12	-	-	-	12
Truck Driving	9	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	[illegible]
Business & Office	-	-	11	-	-	-	-	-	11
Typewriter Repair	-	10	4	-	-	-	-	-	14
Silk Screening	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	8	8
Photography	-	-	-	-	-	10	-	-	10
Small Engine Repair	5	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5
Total	23	37	95	25	58	33	62	95	428

TABLE 14

STAFF RESPONSES TO EACH OF THE 19 ITEMS
ON THE PROGRAM EVALUATION FORM

Item	Camp Hill		Grater-ford		Hunting-don		Muncy		Rock-view		Greens-burg		Pitts-burgh		Dallas		Total	
	N	Score	N	Score	N	Score	N	Score	N	Score	N	Score	N	Score	N	Score	N	Score*
1	5	3.0	2	2.5	16	3.1	4	1.0	5	2.4	5	2.4	6	4.1	7	1.2	50	2.6
2	5	3.2	2	5.0	16	3.5	6	3.5	5	2.0	5	3.6	6	4.2	7	3.5	52	3.3
3	5	4.0	2	2.0	14	3.6	6	3.5	4	2.7	5	2.8	7	3.7	7	3.1	50	3.4
4	5	3.2	2	5.0	16	4.1	6	4.5	5	3.9	5	4.0	7	4.3	7	4.2	53	3.9
5	5	3.1	2	2.5	16	3.5	6	3.8	5	3.6	5	4.0	7	3.9	7	4.2	53	3.5
6	5	4.2	2	5.0	16	3.7	5	3.8	5	3.4	5	3.4	7	3.7	7	4.2	52	3.8
7	5	2.9	2	4.0	16	3.0	5	3.8	5	3.2	5	3.0	7	3.9	7	3.0	52	3.1
8	5	3.6	2	4.0	16	3.5	4	3.7	4	3.0	5	3.2	7	4.1	7	3.4	50	3.5
9	5	3.2	2	4.0	13	3.9	4	3.7	4	4.0	5	3.8	7	4.3	7	4.2	47	4.0
10	5	4.0	2	4.5	16	3.7	5	3.8	4	4.5	5	3.4	7	3.9	7	3.8	50	3.8
11	5	4.6	2	5.0	16	4.1	5	4.6	5	4.2	5	3.8	7	4.0	7	4.0	50	4.3
12	5	3.0	2	4.0	16	4.0	4	4.2	5	3.8	5	3.8	7	3.9	7	3.8	50	3.7
13	5	3.6	2	5.0	16	3.9	5	3.7	4	3.8	5	3.6	7	3.7	7	3.8	51	3.7
14	5	3.1	2	3.5	16	3.6	4	4.2	4	4.2	5	4.0	7	3.5	7	3.8	50	3.6
15	5	3.1	2	3.5	16	3.3	3	3.3	4	3.0	5	4.0	7	3.2	7	3.0	49	3.2
16	5	3.2	2	4.5	16	3.8	5	4.2	4	2.9	5	4.0	7	3.5	7	3.4	50	3.7
17	5	4.0	2	4.0	16	4.4	4	4.2	4	3.2	5	4.4	7	4.4	7	4.2	51	4.0
18	5	4.2	2	5.0	14	3.9	4	4.0	4	3.9	5	4.2	7	4.3	7	4.4	49	4.1
19	5	4.2	2	5.0	15	4.0	4	3.7	4	2.9	5	3.8	7	4.4	7	4.5	49	4.0

*0 to .99 = Poor; 1.0 to 1.9 = Fair; 2.0 to 2.9 = Average; 3.0 to 3.9 = Good; 4.0 to 5.0 = Excellent

placing ex-offenders, the lack of congruency between course selection and career goals is a problem that must be corrected before a successful program can fully be developed.

A simple solution would be to intensify the counseling of the offenders in regard to their career plans. Part of this counseling could be an orientation program that allows each offender to have try-out experiences in each course. The offenders also recommend more career counseling. (See Table 15)

TABLE 15
RANK ORDER OF THE MOST FREQUENT RECOMMENDATIONS BY OFFENDERS FOR IMPROVING THE VOCATIONAL PROGRAMS

Rank Order	Description of Recommendation
1	More equipment, supplies and tools
2	More in-class time
3	More practical experience
4	More in-depth course work
5	More text books
6	Better shop conditions
7	Better organization
8	More career counseling
9	More preemployment information
10	More classes at the AVTS

The second evaluation objective was concerned with determining offenders' assessment of the value of their vocational course in obtaining employment. In regard to this objective, a number of inconsistent results occurred. The evidence shows that 30 per cent of the offenders do not have a realistic view of the effect of their incarceration on achieving a successful role in society. In adding to this finding, 60 per cent of the offenders indicated that no one is helping them obtain employment. On the other hand, 87 per cent stated that they were told how their vocational programs could help them get jobs. Furthermore, 94 per cent realize the importance of vocational programs for future employment.

It seems that the correctional institutions provide a good orientation for the offenders in regard to vocational offerings but somehow fail to provide services or information on job placement. Also, it can be concluded that offenders need more intensified counseling before they make vocational course selections.

The following are possible solutions to these problems:

1. Offer a prerelease job-preparation course.

2. Assign one staff person to act as a liaison with agencies that provide services to ex-offenders.

3. Provide a feedback system on the activities of ex-offenders in terms of their employment.

The third evaluation objective was concerned with determining how offenders are selected for various vocational courses. The results show that most offenders have legitimate reasons for being in the vocational programs and in most cases are told about all available vocational offerings. These results show that the correctional institutions are providing a good orientation program in many areas.

The fourth evaluation objective was concerned with determining offenders' self-assessment of their skill levels. Most offenders consider themselves to possess average skill in their course work. Evaluation objective 4B shows the results of the correlations between the offenders' self-assessment and instructors' assessment of their skill levels to be in agreement. All indications show that the offenders have a realistic view of their skill level.

The fifth evaluation objective dealt with determining the correctional institutions' staff assessment on the quality and status of vocational programs. Since the evaluation team did not have time to verify staff responses, no conclusion can be made at this time.

The sixth evaluation objective was concerned with determining offenders' general attitude toward their course work. There seems to be no question that offenders enjoy being in vocational classes. It should be noted, however, that only about seven per cent of the offender population are in vocational classes. It would seem that such a successful program should have more participants. Perhaps more publicity would be the answer to the problem.

The last evaluation objective dealt with determining the number of offenders enrolled in vocational programs. Table 13 indicates that a total of 428 offenders enrolled in 27 different vocational courses. The most popular courses were auto mechanics, welding, masonry and electricity.

APPENDIX A
TRAINING SURVEY

Name _____ Date _____

Name of Program _____

Approximate Number of Hours Completed to Date _____

1. How do you plan to earn a living when you are released? _____

_____

2. What do you think will be your biggest problem related to getting a job?

_____

3. Who is advising you in securing employment? _____

4. Why are you in this course? (Circle one)

a. Only one available
b. Have interests in the course
c. Had previous experience
d. Good course for future plans
e. Something to do
f. Recommended by prison officials
g. Other _____

5. Were you told about all the options available for you in this program?

Yes _____ No _____ Explain _____

_____

6. Were you told how your present program may help you get a job?

Yes _____ No _____ Explain _____

_____

7. Do you enjoy your program work? Yes _____ No _____ Explain _____

_____

8. Do you feel the program offered is improving your ability to earn a living?

Yes _____ No _____ Explain _____

_____

9. At what skill level are you? (Circle one)

a. Superior skill
b. Above average skill
c. Average skill
d. Below average
e. Very little or no skill

10. Please make recommendations for improving the program.

APPENDIX B
PROGRAM EVALUATION FORM

Name of Institution: _____

Person(s) Completing
This Section _____

Date _____ Enrollment _____ Course Title _____

All items are to be assessed with a numerical rating. All items should be completed by the faculty during the self-evaluation and by the evaluation team during the on-site visit.

5 - The item or practice is considered excellent.
4 - The item or practice is considered good (above average).
3 - The item or practice is considered satisfactory (average).
2 - The item or practice is considered fair (below average).
1 - The item or practice is considered poor or nonexistent.

STAFF 5 4 3 2 1		TEAM 5 4 3 2 1
_____	1. To what extent is an advisory committee organized and active?	_____
_____	2. To what extent is evaluation an integral part of the program?	_____
_____	3. To what extent are follow-up studies and evaluations used to determine curriculum revisions and adjustments?	_____
_____	4. To what extent does the curriculum emphasize skill competencies and knowledges of the occupation?	_____
_____	5. To what extent is the course of study developed based on varied student abilities?	_____
_____	6. To what extent does the instructor prepare instruction?	_____
_____	7. To what extent do pupil standards of work performance compare to industry standards?	_____
_____	8. To what extent does the instructional situation replicate good industrial practice and changing technology?	_____
_____	9. To what extent are principles of health and safety evidenced in instruction and student performance?	_____
_____	10. To what extent are appropriate teaching techniques used?	_____
_____	11. To what extent does the teacher guide the student in the learning process with empathy, positiveness and fairness?	_____
_____	12. To what extent do students show an active and sustained interest in work?	_____

5 4 3 2 1		5 4 3 2 1
_____13.	To what extent are students' records of progress maintained by the instructor?	_____
_____14.	To what extent are teacher supervision activities of students meeting their objective?	_____
_____15.	To what extent are the recommendations for program improvement considered and implemented?	_____
_____16.	To what extent is evaluation of pupil progress related to job productivity, work habits and quality of performance?	_____
_____17.	To what extent do instructors have visual supervision of their total facility?	_____
_____18.	To what extent is safety evident in regard to arrangement of equipment, guarding equipment and safety of the student?	_____
_____19.	To what extent is equipment maintained in good working order?	_____